Approved For Release 2006/12/19: CIA-RDP63T00245R000100110054-9

## SECRET

## Journal

## Office of Legislative Counsel

Thursday - 7 April 1955

- 1. I called Congressman Broyhill's office to secure an appointment for Col. White and myself to bring Cong. Broyhill up to date on the site selection problem facing CIA and in particular our determination not to use Langley. Cong. Broyhill came on the phone and informed me that he had met Col. White at the National Capital Planning Commission meeting; that Col. White had then come to his office and briefed him on the situation; and that Col. White had agreed that Mr. Broyhill could tell his associates that after consultation with CIA officials it was his opinion that CIA would not utilize the Langley site. Mr. Broyhill said he appreciated our bringing him up to date, and that if at any subsequent time we wished to go back to Langley or utilize any other site in his district he would be glad to help us pave the way.
- 2. Mr. Lyman Hamilton, of the Bureau of the Budget, and I approved the draft of language to be included in the Military Construction Bill for the construction of a CIA building. Mr. Hamilton suggested the possibility of having the authority run to the Administrator of the General Services Administration rather than the DCI, and also raised the question as to whether the necessity for setting up a direct account in the Treasury for CIA to receive the construction funds would in any way establish an appropriation precedent for us on Capitol Hill. After talking with Mr. Houston and Col. White, I told Mr. Hamilton that the Agency felt strongly that the authority should run to the DCI and that no other problems appeared to be involved. The Bureau of the Budget then approved the sum of \$6,000,000 for the acquisition of land and \$50,000,000 for the construction of the Building.

1. At a meeting on 4 April with Mr. Macy and others at the Bureau of the Budget at which an attempt was made by DD/S to reach agreement on a final figure for construction of a CIA building which would be included in the Military Construction Act, the Bureau of the Budget felt rather strongly that such figure should be held to \$50,000,000. Col. White took the position that it should be \$55,000,000 so that the Agency would be covered not only for the cost of construction but also for the cost of the purchase of land which would be chargeable against the Agency. In addition, we would probably be charged with certain demolition and relocation costs if such action is required. The Bureau of the Budget finally proposed that the bill be drafted to authorize \$50,000,000 plus or minus 10%. There is no known precedent for such drafting and it is felt that the Congress will not authorize legislation in such form. Col. White requested that I secure the views of Roger Jones, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget for Legislative Reference, on this matter and Mr. Jones agrees with our position that such drafting would not be proper. He will talk to the 5 ipul 55 others in the Bureau of the Budget about it.